



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,985	11/30/2000	David M. Morlitz	POU9-2000-0027-US1	2120
7590	10/20/2003			EXAMINER LE, MIRANDA
Philmore H. Colburn II CANTOR COLBURN LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002			ART UNIT 2177	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/726,985	MORLITZ, DAVID M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Miranda Le	2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 20-28, 35-38, 40, 41, 43-47, 53-58, 68-71, 73, 74, 76-80 and 86-88 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 13 August 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 2-5,7,8,10-14,20-28,35-38,40,41,43-47,53-58,68-71,73,74,76-80 and 86-88.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 08/13/2003.
2. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-14, 20-28, 35-38, 40-41, 43-47, 53-58, 68-71, 73-74, 76-88 are pending in this application. Claims 11, 20, 26, 44, 53, 77 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, claims 1, 6, 9, 15-19, 29-34, 39, 42, 48-52, 59-67, 72, 75, 81-85 have been cancelled, claims 86-88 have been added, and claims 2-4, 7, 10-11, 13, 20-21, 35-37, 40, 43-44, 46, 53-54, 58, 68-70, 73, 76-77, 79 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The objection to the specification of the invention has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Drawings

4. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 08/13/03 have been approved, a copy of approved drawing herein is enclosed pp. #6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 11-14, 20-28, 35-38, 40-41, 44-47, 53-58, 68-71, 73-74, 77-80, 86-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leak et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,072 B1), in view of Chen et al. (US Patent No. 6,625,624 B1).

As to claims 11, 26, 44, 77, Leak teaches “a method for providing resources from a Web server to a client computer, the method comprising: receiving a single request from a client computer, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 3, lines 56-67, col. 4, line 1 to col. 5, line 44, col. 6, lines 27-67; “generating a site map including the desired Web page” at col. 6, line 27 to col. 7, line 31, Fig. 8;

“restricting a scope of the site map” at col. 7, line 1 to col. 8, line 54; Leak does not specifically teach “sending an archive file containing the site map to the client computer in response to the single request”. However, Chen teaches this limitation at col. 4, lines 1-62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Leak with the teachings of Chen to include “sending an archive file containing the site map to the client computer in response to the single request” in order to enable users to retrieve and search through old information, even after such information has evolved or disappeared from the original server.

As to claims 20, 53, Leak teaches "establishing a connection with the Web server" at col. 3, lines 31-53, col. 5, lines 3-44;

"sending the single request to the Web server" at col. 6, lines 27-67;

"displaying the Web page at the client computer after said breaking the connection" at col. 6, line 27 to col. 7, line 59.

Leak does not specifically teach the following limitations. However, Chen teaches: "receiving the archive file at the client computer" at col. 4, lines 1-62, col. 8, lines 3-67; "breaking the connection with the Web server" at col. 8, lines 24-33; "decompressing the plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page; and displaying the Web page at the client computer after said breaking the connection" at col. 5, line 1 to col. 6, line 64, col. 1, line 29 to col. 2, line 16.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Leak with the teachings of Chen to include "receiving the archive file at the client computer; breaking the connection with the Web server; decompressing the plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page" in order to enable users to retrieve and search through old information, even after such information has evolved or disappeared from the original server.

As to claims 2, 35, 68, Chen teaches "compressing the plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page into the archive file" at col. 4, lines 1-62.

As to claims 3, 36, 69, Chen teaches “selecting the archive file from a plurality of archive files” at col. 4, lines 1-62, col. 5, lines 1-58, Fig. 4.

As to claims 4, 37, 70, Chen teaches “including a plurality of resources associated with an additional Web page in the archive file” at col. 4, lines 1-62, col. 5, lines 1-58, Fig. 4.

As to claims 5, 38, 71, Leak teaches “receiving a depth value from the client computer” at col. 9, line 10 to col. 10, line 59;

“identifying a plurality of additional Web pages associated with the desired Web page” at col. 9, line 10 to col. 10, line 59;

“limiting a number of Web pages in the plurality of additional Web pages using the depth value” at col. 9, line 10 to col. 10, line 59;

“including the plurality of resources associated with the limited number of Web pages in the archive file” at col. 9, line 10 to col. 10, line 59.

As to claims 7, 40, 73, Chen teaches “including metadata from the desired Web page in the archive file” at col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 67, col. 8, lines 3-67.

As to claims 8, 41, 74, Chen teaches “keywords found in the desired Web page, parent Web pages of the desired Web page, child Web pages of the desired Web page, links found in the desired Web page, administrative contacts for the desired Web page, and meta-tags found in the desired Web page” at col. 1, lines 41-56, col. 6, lines 1-4, col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 67.

As to claims 12, 45, 78, Chen teaches “receiving a size value from the client computer; and limiting the size of the archive file to the size value” at col. 4, lines 1-62, Fig. 4.

As to claims 13, 46, 79, Leak teaches “wherein the restricting the scope of the site map includes restricting the scope of the site map to include Web, pages having an LRL that includes a sub-string that the URL of the desired Web page includes” at col. 6, lines 27-67.

As to claims 14, 47, 80, Leak teaches “receiving a value from the client computer; and limiting a number of Web pages in the site map to the value” at col. 9, line 9 to col. 10, line 59.

As to claims 21, 54, Chen teaches “the archive file contains a plurality of resources associated with an additional Web page linked to the desired Web page, and wherein said method further includes: displaying the additional Web page after said breaking the connection” at col. 9, line 1 to col. 10, line 31.

As to claims 22, 27, 55, Chen teaches “indicating a size value in the single request, the size value indicating the maximum size of the archive file” at col. 4, lines 1-62, Fig. 4.

As to claims 23, 56, Chen teaches “the archive file in said receiving an archive file contains metadata for the desired Web page, and wherein said method further includes: searching the metadata after said breaking the connection” at col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 67, col. 6, lines 1-4, col. 8, lines 3-67.

As to claims 24, 57, Leak teaches “the metadata is selected from the group comprising: keywords found in the desired Web page, parent Web pages of the desired Web page, child Web pages of the desired Web page, links found in the desired Web page, administrative contacts for the desired Web page, and meta-tags found in the desired Web page” at col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 67, col. 6, lines 1-4.

As to claims 25, 58, Chen teaches “searching the site map after said breaking the connection” at col. 8, lines 3-67.

As per claim 28, Leak teaches “indicating in the single request the maximum number of Web pages in the site map” at col. 9, line 10 to col. 10, line 59.

As to claims 86, 87, 88, Chen teaches “the archive file includes a plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page” at col. 4, line 1 to col. 5, line 59.

7. Claims 10, 43, 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leak et al. (US Patent No. 6,182,072 B1), in view of Chen et al. (US Patent No. 6,625,624 B1), and further in view of Becker et al. (US Patent No. 5,937,411).

As to claims 10, 43, 76, Leak teaches “authenticating a manifest file; and including the manifest file in the archive file” at col. 2, lines 36-53, col. 3, lines 29-38.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Leak, Chen with the teachings of Becker to include “authenticating a manifest file; and including the manifest file in the archive file” in order to provide a digital signature for verifying the integrity of the archive file.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments concerning “Kloba is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of restricting a scope of a site map and/or a site map being restricted in scope”, with respect to claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-14, 20-28, 35-38, 40-41, 43-47, 53-58, 68-71, 73-74, 76-88 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

ml
Miranda Le
October 2, 2003



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER